REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 5 and 14-18 are currently being amended. New claims 23-30 are being added. Support for these amendments can be found at least in the drawings and in the specification on page 7, lines 17-19, page 13, line 3 through page 15, line 15, page 17, lines 7-23, page 24, line 15 through page 26, line 6, page 28, line 1 through page 29, line 8, page 30, line 4, page 32, lines 8-12, and page 79, line 18 through page 80, line 2.

This amendment adds and changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-30 are now pending in this application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6 and 8-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,751,454 to Thornton ("Thornton") in view of U.S. Publication 2003/0233278 to Marshall ("Marshall"). Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thornton in view of U.S. Publication 2005/0046584 to Breed ("Breed"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1 and 14

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites "wherein the first terminal device is arranged such that the first terminal device cannot be directly operated by the user", and "a step of the first terminal device detecting a change in state of an object to be monitored, and operating according to a detected state of the object, wherein the modified predetermined parameter determines an operation that is performed by the first terminal device according to the state detected by the first terminal device." The references applied in the rejections of the claims fail to disclose at least these features in the context of claim 1.

For example, Thornton does not disclose "wherein the first terminal device is arranged such that the first terminal device cannot be directly operated by the user" as in claim 1. Rather, Thornton discloses that a user directly operates a terminal device. Thus, Thornton does not intend to transmit any modification command to a terminal device provided in a state that it cannot be directly operated by the user.

Thornton also does not disclose "a step of the first terminal device detecting a change in state of an object to be monitored, and operating according to a detected state of the object, wherein the modified predetermined parameter determines an operation that is performed by the first terminal device according to the state detected by the first terminal device" as recited in claim 1. Rather, Thornton merely discloses that upon receiving an instruction/command from an external entity, the terminal device performs an operation according to the instruction/command, and fails to disclose that the terminal device detects changes in state of an object to be monitored and performs an operation according to the detected state.

Independent claim 14, as amended, recites "wherein the first terminal device is arranged such that the first terminal device cannot be directly operated by the user" and "a step of the first terminal device detecting a change in state of an object to be monitored, and operating according to a detected state of the object, wherein the modified predetermined parameter determines an operation that is performed by the first terminal device according to the state detected by the first terminal device" and is thus patentable for reasons analogous to claim 1.

New independent claims 23 and 26

New independent claim 23 recites "a step of the first terminal device detecting a change in state of an object to be monitored, and operating according to a detected state of the object, wherein the modified predetermined parameter determines an operation that is performed by the first terminal device according to the state detected by the first terminal

device" and is patentable for reasons analogous to those discussed above with respect to this feature.

Independent claim 23 further recites "(IV) a step of the first terminal device performing an operation determined in accordance with the modified predetermined parameter, among a plurality of operations which are respectively associated with possible detected states of the object to be monitored and which are to be performed when the state of the object to be monitored has changed", which feature is not suggested by the references applied in the context of claim 23.

For example, Thornton does not disclose "a step of the first terminal device performing an operation determined in accordance with the modified predetermined parameter, among a plurality of operations which are respectively associated with possible detected states of the object to be monitored and which are to be performed when the state of the object to be monitored has changed" as in claim 23. Rather, in Thornton, the terminal device can perform only the same operation according to the instructions from a center. To the contrary, in the presently claimed invention of claim 23, in response to the change in state of the object to be monitored, the terminal device can select an operation that is different from a previous operation, from among plural kinds of operations in accordance with a parameter, and then perform the selected operation.

New independent claim 26 recites "(III) a step of the first terminal device detecting a change in state of an object to be monitored, and operating according to a detected state of the object, wherein the modified predetermined parameter determines an operation that is performed by the first terminal device according to the state detected by the first terminal device" and "(IV) a step of the first terminal device performing an operation determined in accordance with the modified predetermined parameter, among a plurality of operations which are respectively associated with possible detected states of the object to be monitored and which are to be performed when the state of the object to be monitored has changed" and is thus patentable for reasons analogous to claim 23.

New independent claim 29

New independent claim 29 recites "a step of the first terminal device detecting a change in state of the object to be monitored, and operating according to a detected state of the object, wherein the modified predetermined parameter determines an operation that is performed by the first terminal device according to the state detected by the first terminal device." As discussed above with respect to independent claims 1 and 14, Thornton does not suggest this feature.

Moreover, claim 29 recites "a step of the second terminal device presenting plural operations to be performed by the first terminal device according to a detected state of an object to be monitored, so that the user can select an operation from among the presented operations, and the second terminal device accepting the operation selected by the user", which feature is not suggested by the references applied in the context of claim 29.

For example, Thornton does not disclose "the second terminal device presenting plural operations to be performed by the first terminal device according to a detected state of an object to be monitored, so that the user can select an operation from among the presented operations, and the second terminal device accepting the operation selected by the user." Thornton does not to disclose any second terminal that presents operations to be performed by a first terminal device so that the user can select an operation, and the second terminal accepts the selected operation.

Marshall and Breed fail to cure the deficiencies of Thornton.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims as well as for further patentable features recited therein. For example, new dependent claims 25, 28 and 30 recite "wherein the first terminal device is configured to control a device to be controlled, wherein the device to be controlled is installed in the object to be monitored." By contrast, in Thornton, the terminal device performs only an independent operation that is completed in the terminal device, such as reproduction of

music. In contrast to claims 25, 28 and 30, the terminal device of Thornton does not control various devices to be controlled, so that the devices to be controlled can perform operations.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date August 6, 2007

By Thomas G Bilodeau

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,874

Thomas G. Bilodeau
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,438